

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims remaining in the present patent application are numbered 1-36. Claims 1-36 are rejected. Claims 1, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31 and 35 are amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The present Office Action rejected Claims 1, 5-20, and 22-36 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,542 by Blight et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Blight" reference. Applicant has reviewed the above cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 5-20, and 22-36 are not anticipated by Blight for at least the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is in part directed to (emphasis added):

A communication system comprising:
a communication network; and
a plurality of electronic devices coupled to said communication network, each of said plurality of electronic devices including a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface that when enabled presents network connectivity information specific to an associated electronic device implementing said communication interface....

Claims 5-10 that depend from independent Claim 1 also include these limitations.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 11 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is in part directed to (emphasis added):

A method of connection comprising:
providing a communication interface on a first electronic device coupled to a communication network that when initiated by a user at said first electronic device and when initiation of said communication interface at a second electronic device coupled to said communication network is detected, provides to said user pertinent network connectivity information pertaining and unique to said first electronic device necessary for establishing communication paths with said second electronic device coupled to said communication network, wherein said network connectivity information is universally used to establish communication between said first electronic device and said second electronic device coupled to said communication network;

....

Independent Claims 11, 19 and 29 recite similar limitations. Claims 12-18 that depend from independent Claim 11, Claims 20 and 22-28 that depend from independent Claim 19, and Claims 30-36 that depend from independent Claim 29 also include these limitations.

MPEP §2131 provides:

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim.

Applicant respectfully submits that Blight is very different from the claimed embodiments. Applicant understands Blight to teach a resource proxy for mobile wireless electronic devices. Blight teaches that "[w]henver

a resource is detected through one of the network interfaces, e.g., via their automatic resource discovery procedures, a record of the resource is added to the resource table” (col. 10, lines 62-65; emphasis added). In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight discloses that resources are added to the resource proxy through automatic resource discovery procedures.

Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest that a resource includes “a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest “providing a communication interface on a first electronic device coupled to a communication network that when initiated by a user at said first electronic device and when initiation of said communication interface at a second electronic device coupled to said communication network is detected” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 11, and the similar recitations of independent Claims 19 and 29.

With reference to the present specification, embodiments of the present invention are directed towards establishing a communication link between two devices by a user manually pressing a button selector on each device (see at least page 8, lines 21-33; page 10, lines 17-24; page 13, lines 29-33; and page 14, lines 4-8). As described above, Applicant submits that Blight is silent to such a teaching. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest that “each of said plurality of electronic devices including a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim

1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest “providing a communication interface on a first electronic device coupled to a communication network that when initiated by a user at said first electronic device and when initiation of said communication interface at a second electronic device coupled to said communication network is detected” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 11, and the similar recitations of independent Claims 19 and 29.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Blight does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 11, 19 and 29, that these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Blight also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 5-10 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-18 that depend from independent Claim 11, Claims 20 and 22-28 that depend from independent Claim 19, and Claims 30-36 that depend from independent Claim 29. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5-10, 12-18, 20, 22-28 and 30-36 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and are in a condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The present Office Action rejected Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blight in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,175,860 by Gaucher, hereinafter referred to as the “Gaucher” reference. In addition, Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blight. Claims 2-4 depend on independent Claim 1 and Claim 21 depends on

independent Claim 19. Applicant has reviewed the above cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-4, and 21 are patentable over Blight, either taken alone or in combination with Gaucher.

As describe above, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest that “each of said plurality of electronic devices including a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest “at a first electronic device, acknowledging the initiation of a communication interface by a user, said first electronic device coupled to a communication network, and acknowledging initiation of said communication interface by a user at a second electronic device” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 19.

Applicant understands Blight to teach a resource proxy for mobile wireless electronic devices. Specifically, Blight teaches that “[w]henver a resource is detected through one of the network interfaces, e.g., via their automatic resource discovery procedures, a record of the resource is added to the resource table” (col. 10, lines 62-65; emphasis added). In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight discloses that resources are added to the resource proxy through automatic resource discovery procedures.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest that a resource includes “a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface” (emphasis added) as recited in

independent Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight does not teach, describe or suggest “at a first electronic device, acknowledging the initiation of a communication interface by a user, said first electronic device coupled to a communication network, and acknowledging initiation of said communication interface by a user at a second electronic device” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 19.

Moreover, the combination of Blight and Gaucher fails to teach or suggest the claimed embodiments because Gaucher does not overcome the shortcomings of Blight. Applicant understands Gaucher to teach a computer network where an “additional device is automatically and seamlessly registered and configured into the network without requiring any user intervention” (Abstract; emphasis added). Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Gaucher does not teach, describe or suggest that “each of said plurality of electronic devices including a selector for manually initiating a user initiated communication interface” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Gaucher does not teach, describe or suggest “at a first electronic device, acknowledging the initiation of a communication interface by a user, said first electronic device coupled to a communication network, and acknowledging initiation of said communication interface by a user at a second electronic device” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 19.

Applicant respectfully assert that Blight, either alone or in combination with Gaucher, does not teach, disclose or suggest the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1 and 19, that these claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these

claims are thus in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Blight, either alone or in combination with Gaucher, also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-4 that depend from independent Claim 1 and Claim 21 that depend from independent Claim 19. Applicant respectfully submit that Claims 2-4 and 21 overcome the cited art and are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as these claims are dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION


In light of the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims for allowance thereof. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-36 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 12/8/06



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No.: 35,398
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113